

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject patent application are respectfully requested.

Certain amendments of a formal nature have been made to the application.

In particular, the occurrences of "storing device" ("storing means") 45 at page 46, lines 3 and 19 and page 48, line 9 have been changed to "memory device" ("memory means") 45 for consistency with Figure 11.

"Vehicle common server account information 71" has been changed to "vehicle common server account information 101" for consistency with Figure 18.

Reference numeral "26" in Figure 11 has been changed to "36" for consistency with page 44, lines 20-21 of the specification.

"Memory device" 50 in Figure 13 has been changed to "saving device" 50 for consistency with page 50, lines 10, 17 and 21 of the specification. The occurrence of "storing device" at page 50, line 4 has been changed to "saving device" 50.

The drawings were objected to as allegedly failing to show the switching section as recited in claim 19. While not acquiescing in this objection, claim 19 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer in order to advance prosecution.

Claims 19, 20, 22 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112, first paragraph, because of an alleged failure to comply with the written description requirement.

Claims 19 and 27 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to expedite production and thus the rejection of these claims is moot.

By way of example and without limitation, the storing section of claim 20 finds support in the specification at page 63, line 11 to page 65, line 13. Consequently, withdrawal of the Section 112, first paragraph, rejection of this claim is respectfully requested.

By way of example and without limitation, the "assigning information" and the "assigning information registration means" of claim 22 find support in the specification at page 63, line 11 to page 65, line 13. Consequently, withdrawal of the Section 112, first paragraph, rejection of this claim is respectfully requested.

While not acquiescing in the rejections set forth in the office action, claim 1 has been amended to recite providing first information to a portable display device in response to an information request received from the portable display device if the information server receives electronic ticket information from the portable display device and confirms that the passenger has the right to use the vehicle, and providing different, second information to the portable display device if the information server receives no electronic ticket information from the portable display device. By way of example and without limitation, this amendment finds support at page 9, lines 16-18 of the subject patent application. The applied references do not disclose or suggest this feature. Claims 2, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18 and 31-35 have been similarly amended.

Applicant provides the following additional arguments.

With respect to claims 5 and 7, the office action references the disclosure in columns 12 and 23 of Sehr. However, this disclosure has nothing to do with a time or geographical area in which a server can be used.

With respect to claim 9, the office action simply states that this claim is "rejected under the rationale of claim 1." First, claim 9 depends (ultimately) from claim 2, not claim 1. Second, the rationale of claim 1 does not address deviations in transport time and/or transport position of a vehicle.

With respect to claim 6, the office action combines Cohen with the Sehr-Ritter combination. Cohen relates to an externally viewable display panel for a vehicle which displays location-dependent messages. Location is determined using conventional techniques such as GPS. See, e.g., Cohen, col. 4, lines 14-21. The office action effectively acknowledges that Cohen does not disclose sending information about the time and/or geographical location within which the server can be used is over, but maintains that one of ordinary skill in the art "should know" that the system also sends notification to a user that is outside a service range. First, it is not clear why this feature would be needed in Cohen and, second, it is not clear how notification can be sent to a user outside a service range.

With respect to claims 23 and 24, these claims each recite an information recording medium issuing apparatus which issues an information recording medium. Neither Sehr nor Ritter discloses issuing an information recording medium. The office action contends that the

information recording medium issuing apparatus is obvious from the applied references, but fails to identify which portions of Sehr or Ritter describe an information recording medium issuing apparatus. See 6/25/2008 Office Action, pages 10 and 12. Consequently, Applicant respectfully submits that the office action fails to set forth a prima facie basis for the rejection of claims 23 and 24.

With respect to claims 25 and 29, the proposed combination of Sehr and Ritter does not result in "deleting" as set forth in these claims. Indeed, the office action makes no reference to any portion of these documents in the rejection, instead maintaining that "memory is always fragmented for saving resources." 6/25/2008 Office Action, page 18. This conclusory statement does not establish the obviousness of "deleting" as set forth in these claims.

The pending claims are believed to be allowable and favorable office action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By:



Michael J. Shea
Reg. No. 34,725

MJS:mjs
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100